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**1. Be it resolved that same sex couples not be allowed the right to parenthood**

**Melanie**

She said that the biggest problem faced by same-sex couples was simply discrimination. She also stated that a professor from a university said that the result of children from same-sex or opposite-sex were the same. In addition to that information, she also argued that the children of gay women, or lesbians, were more passionate and competent in social life. Her conclusion ended with her thought on bibles.

**Jay**

He had about 4-5 arguments, with a few combining with each other. The first one was about the children, in which having same-sex parents was a bit weird and unhealthy for the children’s mentality. Next, the connected part was that children should have opposite-sex parents, just for the family to be the typical family. He added onto this by stating that having homosexual parents would influence the children negatively; in a gay way. His last argument stated that children were just an item as a part of culture, so therefore adoption should not be allowed.

**My thoughts**

I personally think Jay won. I do not have any discrimination against same-sex couples, as more and more people around the world are coming to recognize homosexual couples. Yet the concern is with the children. Jay’s main arguments mostly related to simply children. Like he stated, children would be affected in a gay way; the children might turn out gay despite not being at the start. Being gay is mostly affected by the nature in which the children grow in and with the parents being of the same-sex, I don’t think the child will be any different, despite having different parental traits.

If it were me I would’ve argued mostly from the neutral point of view. I have to be honest. I think Jay’s arguments were vague yet stronger; Melanie’s precise yet awkward. I don’t want to go against anything, but I do not want to go for anything either. Gay parenthood is a bit weird, but as a ‘couple’, they have the right to host any adopted children.

1. **Be it resolved that sexual orientation cannot be used as a basis for discrimination in housing, education or within the workplace.**

**Sarah & Lauren**

Their argument was that all people were equal. They supported all of it by giving examples of disadvantages like not being able to receive any advantages from companies, etc. Additionally, they keep on stating that the homosexuals are constantly put under pressure from their peers, family and other people who know them by being harassed sexually and physically.

**Daniel & Jennifer**

They did not go straight into the issue but defined the meaning of discrimination first. Discrimination accounted for both gays and straights. Same-sex rape could’ve led some people to turn gay themselves. These examples were mainly based on certain situations or places such as jail. Their conclusion was that homosexuality had a negative impact upon people.

**My thoughts**

This debate was very enjoyable. Both sides were very close to winning the debate; yet one side had to win, and I choose Sarah & Lauren’s team. Daniel’s group argument was specific to certain places while that of Sarah’s group were more broad and overall. With the limited information, despite the strong evidence specific to one single place, the team eventually faltered or lost out to Sarah’s group. Daniel’s group started out welll and Sarah’s group was startled, but at the end the latter were the most confident. Otherwise the debate was very close. Neither were brilliant but nor were they unsuccessful. They successfully got their message across to the people listening and watching.

I would say a similar thing to what Sarah’s group argument stated. All people are equal in most countries (with the exception of a few). People shouldn’t be discriminated because of their sexual orientation, it’s no different from saying blue eyed people shouldn’t come into the aquarium because they have blue eyes. Frankly, what is the different between gay or straight and tall or small? They’re both opposites that tackle people hard in the head but they are eventually nothing. Height is eventually nothing and people’s sexual orientation should be the same.

**3. Sexual orientation conversion therapy is unethical**

**Patrick & Peter**

They simply stated that sexual orientation conversion therapy was unethical. They found evidence that, obviously, homosexuality wasn’t a mental health issue so therefore it shouldn’t be treated as so for the people to be changed. On top of this, their examples magnified the fact that these therapies were rather negative and pressured the person than helping the person. Their conclusion was that this therapy thing has never proven effective. A shocking statement also revealed that the therapists had sex with the patient.

**Yongmin & Zae**

They first stated that homosexuals are made to attend therapy sessions because of social beliefs and religious activities. They added on that therapy for gay people actually helped the gay people… about 70% found it effective. Overall, the therapies helped the people. Their conclusion is that at the end of the day, the clients/patients eventually choose to that the therapy.

**My thoughts**

I think that Patrick’s group won by a large difference. They strongly stated with evidence that therapy was unhelpful and rather impacted the patient in a negative way. They provided examples such as the therapists having sex with the patient, which is not ethical at all. Therapy is supposed to make the person feel better but sexual intercourse is just not right. On the other hand, Zae’s group said that the therapies helped people yet it seemed like their arguments were rather weak compared to those of Patrick’s group. Yet they were unable to counter to the statement about the therapist having sexwith the patient. That gave the critical damage to Zae’s group.

I saw a TV show that had a therapist trying to make a person into a girl mentally (the girl was an unknown transgender because of an accident at an early age) and made her have sex with her twin brother, which was totally unethical. The girl eventually found out that she was a boy originally and became a boy again. Anyways, whatever the situation, this was unethical. The therapist said that they were told to practice it so the girl can become like a girl more, to make the feminine hormones activate. Nevertheless this is so unethical, trying to make people change through sexual contact. Changing gay to straight or straight to gay is the same thing. This would’ve been my argument.

**4. Be it resolved that priests and justices of the peace that refuse to marry same sex couples be charged with committing a hate crime.**

**Ashley & Lisa**

They argue from their side by effeciently reciting stuff from the bible and Christian law to counter. They state that no matter what the bible says, stopping gays from marrying is purely due to discrimination and hatred in homosexual people. They finish off my stated that the priests should just marry people under the name of God, not distiguish people from gay to straight.

**Isaac & Sunny**

They counter by saying that discrimination isn’t in the list of hate crimes. They just refuse to do stuff because it’s for peace and justice. They conclude their stance by saying that priest’s and other people can lose their jobs for marrying two people who are of the same sex.

**My thoughts**

This debate was easily the most exciting and tense debate. Both sides successfully defined every term to help them solidify their arguments and those eventually led to multiple counter attacks, which never ended and could’ve gone for hours. Yet the time was limited and they couldn’t state everything yet I think there is a winner. I couldn’t decide for most of the time; both sides had such solid evidence. I think it was Isaac and Sunny. Ashley and Lisa did well, but Isaac and Sunny were the better because their arguments didn’t just successfully counter the opponent, they were successful in making the oppositions struggle and think. Again, this debate was tense even before the start and close.

Honestly, I have nothing to say about this. People are officially married by priests only if they are Christians. The people’s arguments mainly focused on religious issues, well, because it was the topic, but this topic was hard and limited. I would simply say that they should be charged with hate crime; these priests are holy and need to connect people’s souls no matter what sex the people are. Saying no to a marriage of homosexuals is unethical and discrimination.